



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/651,588	08/29/2003	Bakul Shah	SOLID-P002	9283

7590 07/08/2008
THOMAS B. HAVERSTOCK
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP
162 NORTH WOLFE ROAD
SUNNYVALE, CA 94086

EXAMINER

SMITHERS, MATTHEW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/08/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/651,588	Applicant(s) SHAH ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew B. Smithers	Art Unit 2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 10-12 and 14 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8,13 and 15-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-7 and 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/18/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8, 13, and 15-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 8, 13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,988,101 granted to Ham et al.

Regarding claim 1, Ham meets the claimed limitations as follows:

“A computer-assisted method for translating a logic module interface, comprising the steps of:

determining a first interface of a logic module, the first interface having a first one or more interface element names; and generating a second interface of the logic module, the second interface having a second one or more interface element names; wherein the generating step comprises renaming the first one or more interface

Art Unit: 2137

element names to produce the second one or more interface element names.” see column 6, line 43 to column 7, line 20; column 13, line 40 to column 14, line 56 and Figures 2, 3, and 4.

Regarding claim 8, Ham meets the claimed limitations as follows:

“A computer-assisted method for translating a user module, comprising the steps of: determining a first user module and a translation, the translation mapping a first provider interface to a second provider interface; and generating a second user module according to the translation; wherein the generating step comprises replacing a first reference in the first user module to an element in the first provider interface with a second reference to an element in the second provider interface according to the translation.” see column 6, line 43 to column 7, line 20; column 13, line 40 to column 14, line 56 and Figures 2, 3, and 4.

Regarding claim 13, Ham meets the claimed limitations as follows:

“A hardware processing system, comprising:

a processor;

an instruction translation table; and

a module name translation table; wherein the processor fetches an instruction, decodes the instruction according to a translation stored in the translation table, and executes the decoded instruction, and wherein instruction calls to modules are translated according to the module name translation table.” see column 6, line 43 to column 7, line 20; column 13, line 40 to column 14, line 56 and Figures 2, 3, and 4.

Regarding claim 15, Ham meets the claimed limitations as follows:

“A method for processing a file access request, comprising the steps of:
receiving a file access request having a first string; and
translating the first string to a second string, the second string indicating a file name; wherein the translating step proceeds according to a file name translation table.”
see column 6, line 43 to column 7, line 20; column 13, line 40 to column 14, line 56 and Figures 2, 3, and 4.

Regarding claim 16, Ham meets the claimed limitations as follows:

“A method for providing access to a file system, comprising the steps of:
receiving a file access request; and processing the request; wherein the file access request comprises a file name and a first file name extension, the processing step comprises translating the first file name extension to obtain a second file name extension and providing access to a file indicated by the file name and the second file name extension.” see column 6, line 43 to column 7, line 20; column 13, line 40 to column 14, line 56 and Figures 2, 3, and 4.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 20050018651 granted to Yan et al.

Regarding claim 17, Yan meets the claimed limitations as follows:

“A method for processing a network connection request, comprising the steps of:

receiving a network connection request having a first number; and
translating the first number to a second number, the second number indicating a port number; wherein the translating step proceeds according to a port number translation table.” see paragraphs [0063]-[0064]; [0074]-[0086]; [0100]-[0116]; and Figures 3a, 3c, 10 and 12.

Regarding claim 18, Yan meets the claimed limitations as follows:

“A method for processing a network packet, comprising the steps of:
receiving a network packet, the network packet comprising a protocol type field having a first protocol type identifier; translating the first protocol type identifier to a second protocol type identifier; and routing the network packet according to a protocol indicated by the second protocol type identifier; wherein the translating step proceeds according to a protocol type field translation table.” see paragraphs [0063]-[0064]; [0074]-[0086]; [0100]-[0116]; and Figures 3a, 3c, 10 and 12.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,832,227 granted to Seki et al.

Regarding claim 19, Seki meets the claimed limitations as follows:

“A method for processing a database command, comprising the steps of:
receiving a database command having a first string; and translating the first string to a second string, the second string indicating a database keyword; wherein the translating step proceeds according to a database keyword translation table.” see column 3, lines 1-3; column 4, line 41 to column 5, line 12; and Figures 1 and 8-11.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10-12 and 14 are allowed.

Claims 2-7 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With respect to claim 2, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach wherein the renaming step comprises generating one, or more random strings as the second one or more interface element names.

With respect to claim 3, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach wherein the renaming step comprises hashing the first one or more interface element names.

With respect to claim 4, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach wherein the renaming step comprises adding an offset to the first one or more interface element names.

With respect to claims 5 and 6, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach wherein the generating step further comprises adding one or more dummy interface elements to the second interface.

With respect to claim 7, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach wherein the logic module comprises an operating system and the first interface comprises a set of system calls of the operating system.

With respect to claim 9, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach wherein the first provider interface comprises a set of system calls of an operating system, the second provider interface comprises a translated set of system calls of the operating system, the first user module comprises a software application referencing the first provider interface, and the second user module comprises a translated software application referencing the second provider interface.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew B. Smithers whose telephone number is (571) 272-3876. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel L. Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew B Smithers/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2137